Case	1:21-cr-00483-ENV Document 128	B Filed 12/02/22 Page 1 of 37 PageID #: 2119
		973
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT CO EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW Y	
2		
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	21-CR-483 (ENV)
4	Plaintiff,	United States Courthouse Brooklyn, New York
5	-against-	November 22, 2022 1:00 p.m.
6	CHRIS BANTIS,	1.00 p.m.
7	Defendant.	
8	x	
9	TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR TRIAL BEFORE THE HONORABLE ERIC N. VITALIANO	
10	UNITED STATE	ES SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE BEFORE A JURY
11		
12	APPEARANCES	
13		UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE Eastern District of New York
14		271 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, New York 11201
15		BY: LINDSEY OKEN, ESQ. TARA BRIGIT McGRATH, ESQ.
16		JENNIFER M. SASSO, ESQ. Assistant United States Attorneys
17		FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF NEW YORK
18		One Pierrepont Plaza Brooklyn, New York 11201
19		BY: NORA K. HIROZAWA, ESQ.  MARISSA SHERMAN, ESQ.
20	Also Present:	EMILY MOOSHER, PARALEGAL
21		CAROLINE KISSICK, PARALEGAL PAUL TAMBRINO, AGENT
22		LINDA D. DANELCZYK, RPR, CSR, CCR
23	-	Phone: 718-613-2330 Fax: 718-804-2712
24		Email: LindaDan226@gmail.com
25	Proceedings recorded by m produced by computer-aide	echanical stenography. Transcript d transcription.

PROCEEDINGS

note, does in some ways speak to the circumstances surrounding the arrest.

But obviously to the extent that they are seeking information that is not in the record at this trial, we would ask that the Court instruct the jury that they're not to speculate as to information that is outside the scope of the record.

THE COURT: Ms. Hirozawa.

2.3

MS. SHERMAN: Judge, it's Marissa Sherman. Hi.

The first part of what Ms. Oken just said I think we agree with, which is that whatever testimony and evidence is in the record regarding the arrest, they are free to look at and review.

And I think that if they sent a note then back saying we'd like all the evidence about the arrest, they actually have that in the request for these two transcripts.

The second part about not to speculate. My only concern with using the word "speculate" when we are talking about what he was arrested for, is that that could then cause them to actually speculate that he was arrested for something that has nothing to do with this case. And so we would just ask that the instruction be capped at kind of the first part of what Ms. Oken said.

THE COURT: Is it that it's -- does anyone disagree with the statement that there is no direct evidence of the

evidence in the record, most of which they have already received.

THE COURT: I'm just doing my own speculating.

I assume that the issue is that an NYPD officer made an arrest, and most likely the charge that they are now considering isn't what he put on the card, which is probably true.

> MS. SHERMAN: Correct.

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: He would have no reason to even know

circumstances, we could do sort of the inverse of that, which

is to advise them that some of the testimony that they have

24

25

Case 1:21-cr-00483-ENV Document 128 Filed 12/02/22 Page 8 of 37 PageID #: 2126

## PROCEEDINGS

Ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon. I know you're enjoying your lunch at the moment. We're not going to keep you too long. We wanted to let you know that we received your note.

Counsel and the Court have been working on the transcript and we have now agreed on a transcript, which should arrive here momentarily, and we will provide that to you and the witnesses that you requested in your last note.

Your last note also had a question for me about a fact, which is the arrest of the defendant. But it's a fact. And the fact department is your department. During your deliberations, I don't add to the facts, I don't characterize the facts, I don't catalog the facts.

So as that fact, like any other fact, you have the evidence before you. You're free to look at it. If you need to make requests in connection with it to provide you with additional pieces of evidence, like a transcript, we will endeavor to provide that and give you the opportunity to review it and hopefully find the information that you need. All right?

So that's -- we will send you back to continue your deliberations and also to continue your lunch. And as soon as the transcripts arrive, we will provide that directly to you through the marshal.

And we thank you for your again, attentiveness,

Again, to the extent that we're getting any indication later in the -- and I've that. Juries they say, you know, we're going -- I know we're supposed to go home, can we stay another 40, we think we're blah, blah, and I stay.

22

23

24

25

MS. OKEN: That makes sense, and we're happy to play

PROCEEDINGS

charge is appropriate.

I think, in an effort to supplement that charge and to sort of avoid giving them a charge that very closely mirrors charges that they've already received, we have sort of three proposals that either individually or in combination we think are worth considering to see if that might prompt some movement.

The first is to add some language that is adopted from a case out of the Second Circuit and that was recently blessed by Judge Ross in a recent case that essentially expounds on the policy reasons for delivering an Allen charge and informs the jury that there is no reason to believe that this case would be tried either differently or more exhaustively in the future or that a hypothetical future jury would be better equipped or could more intelligently arrive at a verdict.

And so it sort of helps to supplement the *Allen* charge in terms of giving the jury an explanation for why it is so important that they continue to deliberate. And we're happy to sort of propose some specific language to that effect for the Court's consideration.

The second proposal that I think we briefly raised on the record yesterday is to provide some additional clarity with respect to the verdict sheet. And, again, we're happy to provide some proposed language in terms of what we mean

PROCEEDINGS

specifically by that, but I think the essence of it would be that if the jury has reached a unanimous decision as to one or more of the lines set out in the verdict sheet, they can inform the Court of that. They can check the guilty box and inform the Court of that. Alternatively, or conversely, if they have unanimously determined that none of the boxes should be checked, they can check not guilty and inform the Court of that.

And, again, we're happy to provide some specific language to that effect.

And then the third is a little bit less substantive, but to the extent the Court advises the jury that continuing their deliberations into tomorrow morning is a possibility, we wonder if that might affect how they use their remaining time this afternoon.

So those are sort of three possibilities again that either individually or in combination might help to prompt some movement and give them some new information that they have not yet heard.

MS. HIROZAWA: Your Honor, unsurprisingly, perhaps, we disagree with the government with regard to those suggestions.

First, we move again for a mistrial. I do think that at this point, following the Court's last instruction yesterday as of 5:30 p.m., the jury returned to the jury room,

PROCEEDINGS

deliberated for another hour, returned this morning, began deliberating at about 10 a.m. The jury's now been deliberating for over two days, almost two and a half days, on a case that took about four and a half days to try.

Based on the questions we've received from the jury, there have been substantive questions, requests for testimony, which have been provided. Requests for video playback. And it's clear, I think, that this jury is trying to meaningfully work together, but they simply have been unable to arrive at a unanimous decision, notwithstanding those efforts.

I would note that in none of the notes to the Court has the jury indicated that he have any confusion about the verdict form. The Court did instruct the jury that the verdict form is self-explanatory, but if they had any questions about it, to notify the Court.

And so I don't see any reason to provide further instruction regarding the verdict form, given that there's been no question about the verdict form. We're aware that this jury is quite capable of asking questions about the questions they have.

And additionally they have stated that they are unable to arrive at a unanimous decision, and so I think the government's concern that they may have agreed at something unanimously but simply don't know what box to check, is just not grounded in the notes that we have received, in particular

PROCEEDINGS

1 Court Exhibit 9.

2.3

here.

Additionally, Your Honor, I think we believe that it would be at this point, given that the jury has deliberated for almost another full day since the last instruction, to -- about the duty to deliberate, we believe that it would be coercive to issue an *Allen* charge at this juncture when they have clearly taken that last instruction seriously and made diligent efforts to arrive at a decision.

And instruct -- in issuing an *Allen* charge at this point we believe would force them -- would cause them to believe that it is impermissible not to arrive at a decision.

And we believe that it would be coercive to discuss deliberating until Thanksgiving to create -- to quote/unquote create some movement. I think the type of movement that Ms. Oken's referring to is exactly the type of coercion that we do not want in the jury room.

And so, Your Honor, that would be our request, first the motion for a mistrial and then we're happy to address with further specificity any other questions the Court may have.

THE COURT: Do you want any brief reply, Ms. Oken?

MS. OKEN: I'm happy to very briefly reply to the mistrial application, as well as the suggestion of coercion

With respect to a mistrial application, I think the

Court is well aware of the length of time this jury has been

LINDA D. DANELCZYK, RPR, CSR, CCR Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

deliberating, which is not exceeding long. They had a full day yesterday, albeit with a late start, and I think had less than two hours the prior week.

So I don't think we're at the juncture quite yet where we should be giving serious consideration to a mistrial application, particularly in light of the fact that they have not been delivered an *Allen* charge quite yet.

With respect to the suggestion of coercion, we think that coupled with the Court's standard Allen charge, this language would not cause any coercion, because the jury would be reminded about maintaining any firmly-held views while simultaneously being open to engaging in conversation and revaluating their views, in light of compelling arguments regarding the evidence. So we think the sum total of the Court's instruction would not at all give a suggestion of coercion.

And then finally, I'll briefly address the verdict sheet.

The jury certainly has not in their notes expressed any confusion about the verdict sheet. But I will note that the verdict sheet is not explicit to the effect of these being alternative bases for reaching a verdict. And what I mean by that is, it doesn't use language like if this or this or this or this, and I think as the Court is aware, there was an additional check line added just before this verdict sheet was

PROCEEDINGS

finalized, which I think may have caused some heightened confusion as to how many boxes and where they need to be checked.

So I think some additional clarity could be helpful in terms of advising them that if they have reached unanimity as to one or more, they can alert the Court of that and keep the instruction balanced. We could similarly advise them that if they have reached unanimity as to checking none of them, they could similarly advise the Court of that.

THE COURT: All right, I find myself closer to the defense position than the government has issued here.

The verdict sheet has to be read in conjunction with the charge, and I am convinced that they have done exactly that.

I read their notes to suggest that at this point that they are deadlocked. They have not reached a decision unanimously about anything that would -- on any categories so that they haven't reached the unanimous decision of between guilt and innocence and not guilty because they haven't reached the unanimous position that any one of the tick-box items applies. So that they're -- I'm sure some for guilt and some for not guilty on each one of those tick marks.

When you analyze how long the trial lasted, you have to parse out the colloquies, the openings, the closings, the instructions to the jury, and basically it is pretty close now

PROCEEDINGS

that they have actually been in the deliberating room deliberating about as long as the evidence production part of the trial lasted.

So that any further instruction would really have to be along the lines of the deliberation, the instructions we gave yesterday, which was really a reread of the deliberations instructions and the final charge.

And when you read to commentary to Sand in particular, the Second Circuit commentary, that the language about the majority should do this and the minority should do that and the other, is disfavored and particularly in this context. I think that the Circuit would find it disfavored.

The balance of the charge is -- again, it may be a slight step up from what we, I guess, a reformulation, essentially, of what we read -- of what we read to them yesterday, their duty to more collaboratively in the end not to give up any consciously-held position just for the sake of reaching a final decision.

So I see it as almost a lost cause but trying not to make it a lost cause. We've come up with a version of the Allen charge as it is set forth in Sand, minus the minority language, and I'll ask Scott, it's not that long, to read it now and seek positions of counsel on it.

Scott?

THE LAW CLERK: As I told you in my original

PROCEEDINGS

instructions, this case is an important one to the government.

It is equally important to the defendant. It is desirable if a verdict can be reached, but your verdict must reflect the conscientious judgment of each juror, and under no circumstance must any juror yield his conscientious judgment.

It is normal for jurors to have differences; this is quite common. Frequently, jurors, after extended discussions, may find that a point of view that originally represented a fair and considered judgment might as well yield upon the basis of argument and upon the facts and the evidence.

However, and I emphasize this, no juror must vote for any verdict unless after full discussion a consideration of the issues and exchange of views, it does represent his or her considered judgment.

Further consideration may indicate that a change in original attitude is fully justified on the law and all of the facts. I do want to read to you a statement that is contained in a Supreme Court opinion that is well known to the bench and the bar, and it is this:

That although a verdict must be the verdict of each individual juror and not mere acquiescence in the conclusion of his fellows, yet they should examine the questions submitted with candor and with a proper regard and deference to the opinions of each other; that is what their duty to decide the case if they could consciously do so.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

essentially provides:

PROCEEDINGS

995

You are reminded also that the prosecution bears the burden of proving each element of the offense beyond a reasonable doubt. Do not ever change your mind just because the other jurors see things differently, or just to get the case over with. As I told you before, in the end, your oath must be exactly that - your vote. As important as it is for to you reach unanimous agreement, it is just as important that you do so honestly and in good conscience. What I have just said is not meant to rush or pressure you into agreeing on a verdict. Take as much time as you need to discuss this. There is no hurry. THE COURT: As I said, it's really an embellishment on what we read them yesterday. It may have an affect. think, given the tea leaves here, that this is a truly deadlocked jury in the sense that some have a different view of the facts. Not a confusion about the law, not a confusion about the verdict sheet, it is a disagreement as to whether or not certain facts happened and or the happening of those facts made up with the law that they received the final instruction. MS. OKEN: Understood, Your Honor. With respect to that proposed language, I don't think we have any objections to it but if Your Honor wouldn't mind, I will read the two sentences that was adopted from language that was blessed by

Judge Ross and adopted from a Second Circuit case, which

2.3

PROCEEDINGS

There does not appear to be any reason to believe that the case can be tried again better or more exhaustively than it has been on either side. So there appears to be no reason to believe if the case were to be submitted to another jury that jury would be more intelligent, more impartial, or more competent to decide it then you are.

And so we think that might sort of provide some additional color. We understand that this is a charge that the Court -- the one that the Court read is one that has been reviewed by the Court already, and we have no objection to it but wanted to propose this for some additional language for the Court's consideration.

MS. HIROZAWA: Your Honor, we would object to that language, specifically based on the events that have transpired up until this point and the notes that we've received.

I think that type of charge might be appropriate in a case where a jury has responded with deadlock I think with succession or whether some question about the jury carefully considering the evidence before them.

But here I don't think that's the case and I do think that language would be coercive under the circumstances or a case like a mistrial.

THE COURT: I'm not going to add it, and as I say, my view is more akin to the defense side.

2.3

## PROCEEDINGS

The jury's, I think, told us just the opposite.

That they've worked very hard. That they have scoured the evidence and there's just a disagreement when they, among them, as I say, either attracts themselves and/or how those facts that they agree on relate to the law that we gave them.

This is just an encouragement for them to make a final last effort to the listen to each other, and perhaps somebody -- and it has to be somebody in the room, not somebody out here, persuades them to a different view. We don't know if they're 11 and 1. We don't know if they're 6 and 6.

MS. HIROZAWA: And, Your Honor, on that note, I think the Court's perception based on the notes is likely accurate.

We would request that the Court include the First Circuit addition in this Sand instruction, which simply states in the last paragraph: But if you cannot agree, it is your right to fail to agree, or some other indication that it is permissible for them to not reach an agreement and that's just to curb any potential --

THE COURT: I think that is plain as day in the last sentence, as Scott read it. It doesn't need any further embellishment.

Okay, let's bring them in. Scott will read them the charge, and we'll go from there.

PROCEEDINGS

instructions, this case is an important one to the government. It is equally important to the defendant. It is desirable if a verdict can be reached, but your verdict must reflect the conscientious judgment of each juror, and under no circumstance must any juror yield his conscientious judgment.

It is normal for jurors to have differences; this is quite common. Frequently, jurors, after extended discussions, may find that a point of view that originally represented a fair and considered judgment might well yield upon the basis of argument and upon the facts and the evidence. However, and I emphasize this, no juror must vote for any verdict unless after full discussion and consideration of the issues in exchange of views, it does represent his or her considered judgment.

Further consideration may indicate that a change in original attitude is fully justified on the law and all of the facts. I do want to read to you a statement that is contained in a Supreme Court opinion that is well known to the bench and bar, and it is this:

That although a verdict must be a verdict of each individual juror and not a mere acquiescence in the conclusion of his fellows, yet they should examine the question submitted with candor and with the proper regard and deference to the opinions of each other; that is with their duty to decide the case if could conscientiously do so.

2.3

## PROCEEDINGS

You are reminded also that the prosecution bears the burden of proving each element of the offense beyond a reasonable doubt.

Do not ever change your mind just because the other jurors see things differently, or just to get the case over with. As I told you before, in the end, your vote must be exactly that - your vote. As important as it is for you to reach unanimous agreement, it is just as important that you do so honestly and in good conscience. What I have just said is not meant to rush or pressure you into agreeing on a verdict. Take as much time as you need to discuss this. There is no hurry.

THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen, that's the instruction. We hope that is of value to you. We send you back to the jury room and allow you to continue your discussions.

(Jury exits the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Any further inquiry of counsel, assuming that there is no verdict, that we have a mistrial, do counsel want to have an opportunity to chat with the jury in the jury room?

MS. HIROZAWA: Yes, Your Honor, from the defense.

THE COURT: The government, too?

MS. OKEN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, so I'll try to -- we can't keep

Case 1:21-cr-00483-ENV Document 128 Filed 12/02/22 Page 29 of 37 PageID #: 2147

PROCEEDINGS

they needed additional time to deliberate and send them back to the jury room to answer that question so that they can do it collectively rather than having different voices or whatever from the jury box.

I propose that we send back a single inquiry and,

I'll have Scott read it to you, see what the views of counsel might be.

THE LAW CLERK: Status inquiry from the Court.

Please reply in writing. Does the jury request the Court to provide additional time for deliberations.

MS. OKEN: Your Honor, this is Lindsey Oken for the government.

I think given that the Court's last instruction, which was after 4 p.m. today, that informed the jury that there was no hurry, no rush, and that they should take all the time that they need, I think the absence of the communication in the interim is a bit telling, especially from a jury that has been quite active in terms of communication.

So I think we would suggest that silence suggests that they are digging back in and that in the absence of any indication that they remain deadlocked, we should assume that they have relied on the Court's representation that there is no hurry and that they are entitled to take as much time as they need.

So I think we certainly have no issue with making an

PROCEEDINGS 1003 1 inquiry of the jury, but I think we would propose a slightly 2 tweaked version that sort of inquires whether they would like 3 to continue deliberating into this evening or whether they 4 would like to return tomorrow to continue their deliberation. 5 MS. HIROZAWA: The defense has no objection to the 6 language the Court has proposed. 7 I think in light of the Court's last instruction, 8 which did not include the portion of the instruction that 9 advises them that it is permissible not to arrive at a 10 verdict, I think that this language would be adequate. 11 THE COURT: Yes, I think they may have notes passing 12 in the interim here, but we've sort of set 6:30 as a break 13 point. 14 I interpret their silence that they're waiting, as 15 we did last night, for us to tweak them as opposed to them to 16 tweak us. And I kept it as open as possible. I didn't say 17 when they would get, you know, time before they needed 18 additional time. 19 And the answer is either going to be yes or no. 20 MS. OKEN: Sure. 21 THE COURT: And if the answer were to be yes, it 22 would not be tonight. 23 MS. OKEN: Sure. 24 We understand that. It does make sense to make an

inquiry of the jury at this juncture. I think our only

25

Case 1:21-cr-00483-ENV Document 128 Filed 12/02/22 Page 32 of 37 PageID #: 2150

PROCEEDINGS

your desire to further deliberate, but not tonight. We will then indeed reconvene tomorrow.

All of us very much admire and appreciate your dedication to serve and understanding how important your service is overall to both sides and to the rule of law. So you've been a model of working hard and deliberating hard, and we all appreciate that.

But we will take our break for the night. And as you may recall way, way back when you were before Judge Kuo, the jury selection, she assured everyone that whatever happened in the case that you wouldn't be working on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving past 1 p.m., and we will keep that promise that Judge Kuo made.

So you have no concerns, so if you have travel plans to keep or turkeys to stuff or whatever, you'll be out no later than 1. Obviously if you have a verdict in advance of that we're not going to keep you until 1, we'll let you go as soon as you've completed your work.

But all of the other admonitions continue to apply. Again, use the overnight hours as a chance to relax and to reflect on the work that you've done today and the work that lies ahead. That reflection is a silent reflection. You're not sharing it with anyone. You're not to discuss the case amongst yourselves or with anyone else.

There is what I call the "radio silence rule".

deliberation room.

PROCEEDINGS

You're not by any form of communication not just walkie-talkie or social media or telephone or whatever, discuss the fact that you are a juror, that you're coming to the courthouse, or anything that even remotely touches upon the case.

You're not to use the overnight hours to do some homework. Again, there's no homework in this school. Everything is done in here in the courtroom and in the jury

So there's no research, electronic or otherwise, that you can do about anything that remotely touches on the case. And certainly not permitted to visit any of the locations that have been identified in the course of the trial.

There is also a concern about media attention to this case, and to the extent, again, using that broader definition of "media", should it pop up, appear on your internet screen or on your TV or radio or in your newspaper, you are to totally disregard it.

And I still encourage you to try to tune out, disregard media accounts of any legal proceeding for fear that it will confuse you about what your responsibilities are here.

And we know that we're all sensitive to commutation issues, particularly on a, quote, get-away day, unquote, but we're going to ask you to try to come into the courthouse somewhere between 9:15 and 9:30, so we'll try to start a half

Case 1	:21-cr-00483-ENV Document 128 Filed 12/02/22 Page 37 of 37 PageID #: 2155		
	PROCEEDINGS 1009		
1	hour earlier and build in some additional time for you, and		
2	then we will resume deliberations as soon as all 12 of you are		
3	here and you're in the deliberation room behind the closed		
4	doors and in the custody of the marshal.		
5	So, again, we appreciate your time and your service,		
6	bid you a pleasant evening, and look forward to being with you		
7	tomorrow morning.		
8	Have a pleasant night.		
9	(Jury exits the courtroom.)		
10	THE COURT: Okay, well I guess we'll see everybody		
11	tomorrow.		
12	MS. OKEN: Thank you, Your Honor.		
13	THE COURT: Have a pleasant evening.		
14	MS. OKEN: You, too.		
15	* * * * *		
16	(Proceedings adjourned at 6:55 p.m. to resume on		
17	November 23, 2022 at 10:00 a.m.)		
18			
19	* * * *		
20			
21	EXHIBITS		
22	COURT PAGE		
23	7 and 8 975		
24	9 986		
25	10 1004		